

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/990,133	11/21/2001	Petri Boman	915-400 2111		
4955 WARE FRESS	7590 02/07/2007 SOLA VAN DER SLUYS &	EXAMINER			
ADOLPHSON, LLP			PHAM, TUAN		
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MONROE, CT	Γ 06468		2618		
	•	•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/07/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/990,133	BOMAN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
TUAN A. PHAM	2618

	TUAN A. PHAM	2618					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED on 01/08/2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		100/) 145-					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL	olioman with 27 CED 44 27 must be	filed within two month	a of the date of				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS							
	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecanse				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for							
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	⊠ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi wided below or appended.	Il be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8,10-21 and 25-29</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		•					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce hecause.				
See attachement.		ii condition for allowa	nec because.				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. Other:							

Ø.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant proposed amendment to independent claims 1, and 28, filed on 01/08/2006 in response to final Office Action mailed on 11/07/2006. The amendments changed the scopes of the claims, which required further search and consideration with new ground rejection.

MATTHEW ANDERSON SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER